

Serial No. 09/624,051

- 7 -

Art Unit: 2157

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated November 17, 2003 in the above identified application for United States Patent. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-16 and 19-20 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102, citing the article "Active Storage Nets" by David Nagle ("Nagle"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nagle discloses a system for combining active storage networks with network attached secure disks (NASDs). The system described by Nagle includes a number of client systems that communicate with one or more NASDs through one or more active routers, and potentially also through one or more active switch and/or active hub devices. As shown and described by Nagle, one or more Storage Area Networks (SANs) can be used to interconnect the devices in the Nagle system, in order to provide data transfers between the client systems and the client systems.

Nowhere in Nagle is there disclosed or suggested any system or method for facilitating operations related to data storage between a first device and at least one data storage unit in a computer network, including:

a filesystem that indicates location of data stored on at least one data storage unit,  
and  
circuitry that processes network protocol data units associated with the *operations based on storage services protocol set information to facilitate transmission of the data unit, wherein said processing of the protocol data units includes encapsulating non-network protocol transactions into the network protocol data units*. (emphasis added)

Serial No. 09/624,051

- 8 -

Art Unit: 2157

as in the present independent claims 10 and 1. In contrast with the claimed encapsulation features, Nagle teaches using *protocol conversion* between network protocols. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 7 on page 4 of Nagle, the Active Router is described as performing a conversion from LAN (Local Area Network) to SAN (Storage Area Network) protocols. In similar contrast with the present independent claims 10 and 1, Nagle teaches the caching of data from an NASD in an Active Router device in Fig. 8 on page 4, so that a client directly *accesses the cached data* in the Active Router using the SAN protocol. Nagle includes no hint or suggestion of even the desirability of providing for encapsulation of one or more non-network protocol transactions into one or more network protocol data units, as in the present independent claims 10 and 1.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Nagle does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 10 and 1. Accordingly, Nagle does not anticipate the present independent claims 10 and 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102. As to claims 2-7, 11-16 and 19-20, they each depend from claims 10 and 1, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over Nagle for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner also rejected claims 8-9 and 17-18 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, again citing Nagle, and citing sections from Chapter 7 of "Security in Computing" by Pfleeger ("Pfleeger"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the excerpt cited by the Examiner, Pfleeger generally describes the principles underlying design of trusted operating systems, and lists auditing and logging within the security features of trusted operation systems. Like Nagle, Pfleeger includes no disclosure or suggestion of any system or method for facilitating operations related to data storage between a first device and at least one data storage unit in a computer network, including:

Serial No. 09/624,051

- 9 -

Art Unit: 2157

a filesystem that indicates location of data stored on at least one data storage unit,  
and  
circuitry that processes network protocol data units associated with the *operations based on storage services protocol set information to facilitate transmission of the data unit, wherein said processing of the protocol data units includes encapsulating non-network protocol transactions into the network protocol data units.* (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claims 1 and 10, from which claims 8-9 and 17-18 depend.

The Pfleeger reference is not specifically directed towards providing storage information over a network, and does not present solutions specific to moving storage transactions through disparate protocols in a networked environment.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that the combination of Nagle and Pfleeger does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1 and 10, from which claims 8-9 and 17-18 depend. Accordingly, the combination of Nagle and Pfleeger does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. with regard to the present independent claims 1 and 10. As claims 8-9 and 17-18 depend from claims 1 and 10, they are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Nagle and Pfleeger for at least the same reasons. Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone David A. Dagg, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Serial No. 09/624,051

- 10 -

Art Unit: 2157

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

MARCH 4 2004  
Date

David A. Dagg  
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park Drive  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-221